

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/541,069	03/30/2000	Gregory A. Tomasch	LAM2P151	4441
25920	7590 11/22/2004		EXAMINER	
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP			KEASEL, ERIC S	
710 LAKEWA SUITE 170	AY DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085		3754	· · · · · ·	

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/541,069	TOMASCH, GREGORY A. V
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit
	Eric Keasel	3754
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		• ——
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: 2-7.		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 21</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10. Other:		Luc Peasel 19Nov2004 Eric Keasel

Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3754 Continuation of 2. NOTE: applicant argues that the proposed change of scope does not raise new issues. However, applicant then argues how they feel that the amended claims would not be properly rejected under potential new grounds of rejection, which are clearly new issues that would require further consideration. There are also potential double patenting issues with US Patent Numbers 6,601,824 and 6,390,448, which also require further consideration.